

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of July 9, 2009, claims 1-4, 7-10 and 12 are rejected. Additionally, claims 5, 6 and 11 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Furthermore, the drawings and the specification are objected to. In response, claims 2, 8, 10 and 12 have been amended. Additionally, new claims 13 and 14 have been added. Support for new claims 13 and 14 is found in the current application at, for example, Fig. 4, original claim 12 and page 9, lines 3-12. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments, the new claims and the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 2, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action states that claims 2, 8 and 10 disclose “a filter” for filtering “audio signal” and that there is no such “filter” disclosed in the drawings. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 4 in the current application discloses a low pass filter (80) that feeds forward to a supply ripple pre-compensation circuit (60), as described on page 8, lines 13-32, of the specification. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings in Applicants’ specification disclose the filter for filtering audio signal in claims 2, 8 and 10.

Additionally, the Office Action states that the phrase “the filtered audio signal and thus only a part of a frequency content of the audio signal is” in claims 2, 8 and 10 is incomplete or unclear. In response, claims 2, 8 and 10 have been amended to replace the phrase “the filtered audio signal and thus only a part of a frequency content of the audio signal is” with the phrase “*only a part of a frequency content of the audio signal is.*”

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 2, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Office Action also states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the plurality of different channels” in claim 12. In response, claim 12 has been amended to replace the phrase “the plurality of different channels” with the phrase “*a plurality of different channels.*” Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn. Applicants note that claim 12 has been further amended to replace the phrase “input signal for the pre-compensation” with the phrase “*the input signal for the pre-compensation.*”

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s review of and determination that claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 5, 6 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, the Office Action states that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At this time, Applicants choose not to rewrite claims 5, 6, 11 and 12. Instead, Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are allowable based on the remarks below. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 13 and 14 are similar to claim 12. Because claim 12 recites allowable subject matter and that new claims 13 and 14 are similar to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 13 and 14 recite allowable subject matter and are therefore allowable.

Objections to the Drawings

As described above, the Office Action states that claims 2, 8 and 10 disclose “a filter” for filtering “audio signal” and that there is no such “filter” disclosed in the drawings. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 4 in the current application discloses a low pass filter (80) that feeds forward to a supply ripple pre-

compensation circuit (60) and filters the audio signal output by a channel divider (52). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings disclose the filter for filtering audio signal in claims 2, 8 and 10. Thus, Applicants hereby request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

Regarding the Office Action's suggestion to add section headings, Applicants respectfully decline because the indicated suggestions in 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC § 111(a), but per 37 C.F.R. § 1.51(b) are only guidelines that are suggested for Applicants' use. The section headings are not mandatory, and in fact when Rule 77 was amended in 1996 (61 FR 42790, Aug. 19, 1996), Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, stated in the Official Gazette:

“Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... 1.77 merely expresses the Office's preference for the arrangement of the application elements. The Office may advise an applicant that the application does not comply with the format set forth in 1.77, and suggest this format for the applicant's consideration; however, the Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77.”

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully decline to add the suggested section headings.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by French et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,455, hereinafter “French”). Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Stengel (U.S. Pat. No. 5,442,317). Claims 2, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over French or Stengel. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are neither anticipated by French and Stengel nor obvious over French or Stengel for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Applicants respectfully assert that French fails to disclose that “*the supply ripple pre-compensation circuit compensates the voltage ripples on the supply voltage based on the input signal*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by French.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

French discloses a composite bridge amplifier (120) that includes a control electronics block (124), an amplifier power supply block (128) and a low voltage power supply block (160), which includes a centering block (200). (See Fig. 3, column 5, lines 30-36, and column 7, lines 10-11, of French). French further discloses that the centering block (200) compensates for the imbalanced ground currents generated in the control electronics block (124). (See Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 52-59 of French). However, Applicants respectfully submit that French fails to disclose that the centering block (200) compensates the voltage ripples on the supply voltage. Applicants also respectfully submit that French fails to disclose that the control electronics block (124) compensates the voltage ripples on the supply voltage produced by the amplifier power supply block (128), as suggested in the Office Action. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that French fails to disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1. Because French fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by French.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Stengel fails to disclose that “*the supply ripple pre-compensation circuit compensates the voltage ripples on the supply voltage based on the input signal*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Stengel.

Stengel discloses that an amplifier (400) can compensate for changes in supply voltage variations such as via an external signal (448) by adjusting the duty cycle of pulse-width modulation (PWM) signals (422) and (450). (See Fig. 4 and column 6, lines 61-64 of Stengel). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Stengel fails to disclose

that the amplifier (400) compensates for changes in supply voltage variations based on an input signal to the amplifier (400). As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that Stengel fails to disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1. Because Stengel fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Stengel. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is neither anticipated by French nor anticipated by Stengel.

Dependent Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Independent Claim 4

Independent claim 4 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 4 and independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is also neither anticipated by French nor anticipated by Stengel.

Dependent Claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5 and 6 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 4.

Independent Claim 7

Independent claim 7 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 7 and independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is also neither anticipated by French nor anticipated by Stengel.

Dependent Claim 8

Claim 8 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 7. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 7.

Independent Claim 9

Independent claim 9 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 9 and independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is also neither anticipated by French nor anticipated by Stengel.

Dependent Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-12 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 9.

New claims 13 and 14

Claims 13 and 14 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 7, respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 13 and 14 are allowable at least based on allowable claims 1 and 7, respectively. Additionally, as described above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 14 are similar to claim 12. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 14 recite allowable subject matter and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the claims amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Esguevillas et al.

Date: September 30, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111